

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,592	08/26/2003	Shinichiro Yanagawa	A1585.0007	2404
32172	7590 10/03/2006		EXAM	INER
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			SINGH, PREM C	
41 ST FL.	E OF THE AMERICAS (67	H AVENUE)	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			. 1764	•
			DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/647,592	YANAGAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Prem C. Singh	1764		

	Prem C. Singh	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL		51 1 111 1				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		jeoted ciaiiiis.				
	• • • •	omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
 5 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 changes the scope and requires further consideration and search. Amendment to claim 1 (part 4) brings in new limitation.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's argument on the recycle and the concentration of dialkyl biphenyls is not persuasive as previously discussed in the last Office action (Page 6, paragraph 2). The Applicant's argument on the 4,4'-dialkylbiphenyl having high melting point that will precipitate as a crystal, when cooled, is not persuasive and was addressed in the last Office action (Page 6, paragraph 4). These limitations were not included in the claims. The Applicant's argument that Mitsao has an object of preparing 4-alkyl products with selectivity and it does not disclose a method of reducing the content of 4,4'-dialkyl biphenyls in the product, is not persuasive as previously discussed in the last Office action (Page 7, paragraph 2).

Mu

Framina -

Supervision Petro Examinar Petro, 250 George 1700